

REMARKS

The Official Action of June 1, 2004 has been carefully considered and reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The courtesy of Examiner Shosho in discussing this application by telephone with the undersigned on October 7, 2004 is acknowledged with appreciation. The Examiner advised that the Advisory Action mailed September 27, 2004 inadvertently had the status of the claims reversed: claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-27 and 30-36 should have been listed as "rejected", and claim 29 should have been listed as "objected to". The Examiner also advised that the amendment to claim 32, when entered, would overcome the outstanding rejections to this claim.

Applicants have now repeated the amendments made in the (unentered) Amendment After Final dated 3 September 2004 with the exceptions that the subject matter covered in claim 37 of that amendment has been included in claim 1 of the present amendment; the recitation of the alkyl diols in claim 1 has been made to conform with the description in the specification at pages 28-29; dependent claims 5 and 6 have been amended to take account of the amendment to claim 1; and a new claim (claim 66) has been added which corresponds to claim 32 as previously on file. With respect to claims 5 and 6, Applicants respectfully note that the specification as filed supports a wetting agent that comprises a combination of the described compounds (see, e.g., original claim 4).

The indicated allowability of Claim 29 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims has been noted with

appreciation. Claim 29 has now been canceled and rewritten in independent form as new Claim 37. This claim includes all of the limitations of base Claim 1 and any intervening claim (i.e., Claim 10). New Claims 38-65 are dependent claims which correspond with the claims depending from Claim 1.

Claim 3 has been canceled to remove the basis for the objection at paragraph 2 of the Official Action. Claims 32 and 33 have been amended in the manner courteously suggested by the Examiner at paragraph 4 of the Official Action to remove the basis for rejection to these claims. All claims as amended are respectfully believed to be sufficiently definite to satisfy the dictates of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been amended to limit the alkylene glycols in the recited Markush group of wetting agents in accordance with the disclosure in the specification at, for example, the paragraph bridging pages 28-29. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are free of the prior art rejections appearing at paragraphs 6-10 of the Official Action for reasons next discussed.

Claim 1 as amended now recites a specific wetting agent that is not shown or suggested in the primary reference, EP 851005, which reference is cited in the rejections appearing at paragraphs 6-10 of the Official Action. EP 851005 discloses, for example, ethylene glycol, diethylene glycol, and propylene glycol, but does not disclose the claimed wetting agent either alone or in combination with the cited secondary references.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended patentably distinguish from the cited art and that the application is otherwise in allowable form. An early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited and is believed to be fully warranted.

Respectfully submitted,



CLIFFORD J. MASS
LADAS & PARRY LLP
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023
REG. NO.30,096(212)708-1890